DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 009 EA 026 913

AUTHOR Schneider, Lydia; Kinavey, Randy
TITLE Zig-Zag--The Zeitgeist of One School's Change.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; Organizational Climate; *Organizational Objectives; *Participative Decision Making; Resistance to Change; School Based Management; *School Restructuring; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Influence

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a history of restructuring efforts undertaken since 1991 at one high school located in a predominantly white suburban community. Data were gathered through document analysis, interviews, and a faculty survey (to which 35 out of 63 teachers responded). Since the late 1980s, the school's student population declined and became increasingly diverse. School restructuring was hampered by periodic, major changes in administrative leadership. For example, during the 1991-92 school year, many faculty made a strong commitment to restructuring; however, in fall 1992, the new principal announced that the program would be suspended. He later championed the formation of a "Futures Committee," in which teachers worked collaboratively to develop a new school schedule for the best use of student/teacher time. The school-site council then rejected their proposal. This was truly consensus decision making on the part of the entire school, but the problem was that the process was not clear to the entire faculty. Leadership needed to explain the decision process in the interest of teacher morale. Three critical issues--leadership, time, and momentum emerged from examination of the change process. Teachers were frustrated with the limited opportunities for participative decision making and the lack of time for effective planning. A conclusion is that the only way to increase momentum for restructuring is through consistent, focused efforts, with an agenda that is defined by faculty leaders. To counter the minimal sense of continuity of leadership and organizational goals, teachers must participate in school leadership. Appendixes contain a copy of the surveys administered to staff in November 1991 and March 1993. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Schneider
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 385 009

ZIG-ZAG - THE ZEITGEIST OF ONE SCHOOL'S CHANGE

Lydia Schneider, Randy Kinavey

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

X High School is a comprehensive high school, grades 9-12, in the southern end of the X Unified School District. We currently have an enrollment of 1487.

Our attendance area is a predominantly white suburban community. X has only recently become a city and most of the homes, which sell for between $130,000 to 500,000, are relatively new additions to hills which were previously populated by ranches and farms. There are some apartments and condominiums, two large country clubs, several nice shopping centers and X Business Park, one of the largest of its kind, located in our area. Interspersed with these are a few remaining farms with stands of fruit trees and horses in pasture illustrating the sudden changes in our valley.

The student population, like the face of our valley, is changing. In 1988-89, the enrollment was 1656; in October of 1989-90, it was 1542; in October of 1991-92 it was 1487. The decrease in student population can be attributed largely to the state of the economy. A drive through our attendance area would show many "For Sale" signs for people who have lost their jobs or whose companies have been relocated and have left the area. The high rental rate in our area also adds to student turnover.

The X High student population is also becoming more diverse. In 1989-90, there were 1% American Indian, 9% Asian-Pacific Islander, 3% Hispanic, 2% Black, and 85% White. In 1991-92, there were 1% American Indian, 13% Asian-Pacific Islander, 7% Hispanic, 3% Black, and 76% White.

The faculty here is very stable. Despite cutbacks, we have been able to keep most of our teachers, primarily because we have so much seniority. This stability works its two edged magic, with some teachers showing the unmistakable signs of "burn out" and others struggling to either recapture or maintain their enthusiasm for teaching and excitement in the profession. Our young teachers are constantly cut back because of budget, while the old war horses trudge on.

EA 026 913

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The stability of the faculty has not been reflected at the site administrative level. Each year for the past three years, two of the three assistant principals have been new to the school and to the district. We have had a principal fired late in the 1991-92 school year, an interim principal, and a new principal who only lasted through the 1992-93 school year. As a result of budget cuts we have also lost two counselors. In the non-certified staff we have lost two custodial and one and a half office positions. The position of department chairpersons has also been eliminated as a result of these budget cuts.

X High has been in a constant state of remodeling and reconstruction since we opened eighteen years ago. We are lucky to be coming to the end of this process as we have finally moved into our six new buildings. We now have a new dining commons, technology building, science building, music building, administration building, and wrestling gym, additions to our older central building and gyms.

Of course, buildings are not all that create a school atmosphere. What goes on inside those buildings is essential to understanding a school culture. The question of what X High is today strikes many chords. Is it a nurturing environment for student/teacher learning, or is it repressive and mired in mediocrity? Perhaps the answer lies somewhere in between, as most answers to complex questions do. Since 1991-92 our school has changed dramatically, primarily because of constant changes in administrative leadership, and the pervading sense has fluctuated from hopeful enthusiasm, to anger and frustration, to guarded optimism. We have come far, and then retreated to arrive at an understanding of how far we have come.

In 1991, along with the new buildings came a new assistant principal convinced that restructuring was important, and knowledgeable enough to network our school with the various restructuring groups around the Bay Area. Teachers were encouraged to look at our school, its philosophy, and its goals in tandem with students, administrators and parents, to find out how we could truly serve an educational community whose primary functions are to create a climate of intellectual curiosity and to find the tools to satisfy that curiosity.

Restructuring during the 1991-92 academic year went on with warp speed, with meeting after meeting and discussion after discussion. From the first in service on Sept. 8, 1991, with Steve Jubb of the Coalition of Essential Schools explaining principles of change, a tone encouraging evaluation toward restructuring was set. A list of the restructuring oriented meetings of this school year reveals the systematic

emphasis that was being placed on school change:

10/01/91	On-site historians of school change appointed to work with Teacher Action Research Project
10/08/91	Visions meeting/feedback on Steve Jubb
10/16/91	Identify school culture
10/21/91	Time line on Student input regarding school vision
10/23/91	Identification of students for visioning
10/23/91	Thinking and Meaning Centered Curriculum workshop by Lorraine Ritchie
10/29/91	Faculty leaders addressed faculty regarding student input
11/04/91	Second Steve Jubb workshop
11/26/91	Teacher training for gathering student input
12/13/91	Ethnic sensitivity training of faculty (related to school culture)
12/17/91	Restructuring time line revised
1/10/92	Formal student input obtained
1/15/92	SRVEA (union acronym) in-service on restructuring
1/21/92	Mission Statement introduced
1/22/92	Restructuring Committee formed Ethnic Sensitivity Committee formed
2/03/92	Restructuring Schools In Calif. workshop by Lorraine Ritchie
2/10/92	Mission Statement developed
2/12/92	Mission Statement finalized
2/18/92	Coalition of Essential Schools winter conference
3/04/92	1882 Consortium Meeting hosted by Cal High
3/31/92	First formal meeting of Restructuring Steering Committee - Rudy Tretton, facilitator
4/07/92	Multi-Cultural Awareness Committee Mission Statement
4/08/92	Restructuring Steering Committee meeting Rudy Tretton, facilitator Goal setting for 1992-93 re:student/ parent/ business participation in process
4/09/92	Restructuring Steering Committee meeting Topic: What happens next year in light of new principal?
4/29/92	Meetings with cross section of students regarding Multi Cultural Awareness
5/01/92	Faculty meeting topic: Overview of restructuring. Action Plan developed
5/06/92	Staff brainstorming re: parent input for restructuring
5/13/92	Faculty debriefing on results of student input regarding Multicultural Awareness
6/01/92	Open parent meeting for visioning

Some teachers, excited by the possibilities, bought into the idea wholeheartedly, and committed their time and energies to the process. Others sat back and watched,

convinced that this was just another fad down a long road of fads in education. Still others felt shut out and steamrolled, and retreated to their classrooms. Yet, it must be said that the assistant principal was extremely effective in creating overall faculty participation and in guiding the process.

This new administrator lasted precisely one year, after promising to see us through the restructuring process. At the end of the 1991-92 school year, she chose to leave for an administrative position in another district. It was a bitter pill to those who had given their time and energies to her process. They felt a sense of despair, while those teachers who had sat back calling restructuring a fad, smiled knowingly and thought, "I told you so."

The sudden removal of our principal in late April of 1992 at the instigation of parents, left teachers feeling even more betrayed and jittery. Parents were viewed as a threat, since they had "got rid of the principal." Teachers were afraid they had made a parent "hit list" and tensions were high. A second assistant principal with many years on staff was rejected as new principal, prompting his departure for another school district. The only carryover into this school year was one vice principal who had been on staff for a total of one year. Everyone was the enemy. It was school politics at its worst.

A committee of teachers, parents, business representatives, SRVEA (San Ramon Valley Education Association) reps, and district officials hired a new principal from out of district. At the same time they gave a morale boost to in district teachers by hiring a new assistant principal from the "local ranks." She was a first time administrator and longtime English teacher in our district. They later also hired another teacher "from the ranks" as a second vice principal.

To begin the year, the new principal announced at our first faculty meeting that he was suspending all work on restructuring for this year. He reasonably suggested that he and his team had to learn about the school as it is before they could change it.

Those teachers involved intimately in the previous year's work were discouraged and disoriented. This may have been a turning point for the year. A strategic opportunity to demand continuing work toward restructuring was lost when no teacher spoke out.

A month later, the new principal announced the formation of a Futures Committee which would be made up of volunteer parents, students, and teachers. He outlined the work of the committee to identify three things that could be changed at our school in

the next year, and empowered the committee to make those changes. After a series of after school meetings, the three identified areas were 1) a user friendly schedule, 2) developing a beautification plan, and 3) a shift in responsibility for a clean campus to the students.

The inconsistencies in this list, as opposed to the systematic nature of restructuring the previous year, reveals how much momentum and direction had been lost.

The emphasis on a "user friendly schedule," was in the proper realm of restructuring, unlike the other two easily measurable but relatively trivial objectives. Unfortunately, the original stakeholders who committed so much the previous year's restructuring efforts did not return to work on this new committee. While this was an "open window" to reestablishing restructuring as a priority, teachers had not been educated to the fact that they were the proper leaders of restructuring. This was a key failure of the previous year's efforts.

CASE STUDY PROJECT

As we noted in the school change schedule listed earlier, during the fall of 1991 the two authors of this case study were asked to become historians of the change process at X High. To support us in this effort we became members of the Teacher Action Research Project sponsored by the Bay Region IV Professional Development Consortium. Our charge was to study the school change process at our school over a three year period in preparation of a case study analysis of that process. To accomplish this task we gathered data in two forms: 1) school data that were already available to us such as WASC reports, demographic information, school newspapers, yearbooks; and 2) new data in the forms of interviews and surveys that we generated specifically to understand the change process more fully. (See appendices A and B.) The data were analyzed over a six month period in search of themes that seemed to capture the essence of school change at X High School as we came to understand it over time. A discussion of those themes follows.

FINDINGS

Three critical issues have emerged from our examination of the change process at X High. They are: leadership, time, and momentum. It is impossible to separate these issues as they are inexorably intertwined. Nonetheless, we will attempt to identify features specifically associated with each of these topics, and their relationships.

LEADERSHIP

General perceptions of leadership and questions about it need to be examined in order to understand the role of leadership in the change process at X High.

Should leadership in a restructuring process be "top down" or come from the "grass roots"? In other words, is it administratively led or faculty led? How does one define who makes up the leadership and who the leaders should be?

A poll of faculty was conducted in March of 1993 with thirty five respondents on a faculty of sixty three full time teachers. When asked "Who should lead the change process at X High," 85% (30 out of 35) identified teachers as these primary leaders. Other choices (district administration, site administration, students, parents) all received less support. As one teacher said, "Everyone has responsibility, but without teachers leading, it's doomed."

Throughout 1991-92 an effort was made to include all teachers in planning for restructuring. A new assistant vice principal hired specifically for her background in restructuring wisely chose a process that involved a majority of the faculty, actually paving a path toward faculty participation and leadership throughout the year. Half day faculty meetings were used for visioning, creating a mission statement, identifying goals, identifying desired student outcomes, and creating a process for parent participation. Individuals were invited and encouraged to attend workshops throughout the bay area and report back to faculty. Two teachers became site historians, documenting the process of change. Faculty was further encouraged to volunteer for various committees: Restructuring Committee, Ethnic Sensitivity Committee, School Culture Committee, Student Input Committee, etc. Finally, there were conscious attempts to involve recalcitrant teachers in tasks that would foster buy-in. They were personally invited to facilitate certain elements of faculty meetings, and personally encouraged to attend restructuring conferences.

"One thing (assistant principal) did really well was 'grab elbows.' She made it hard for people to say no. It was amazing to see some of the people she got to work for her and stand up and talk to the faculty about the conference they went to," a veteran counselor commented in an interview.

The faculty survey in March of 1993 indicated that there was an overwhelming acknowledgement of the fact that X High needs to make changes. Thirty four of thirty five respondents indicated that they were not satisfied with the present structure in the areas of curriculum, schedule, teacher-student relationships, or decision making. While there was a sense that there should be change, this feeling needed focus. There was a built in resentment that all of the efforts from 1991-92 were futile. It was the job of the 1992-93 administration and interested teachers to redefine the focus and reenergize efforts towards change. This did not happen. Because of this failure in leadership, enthusiasm towards the change process dramatically diminished, and cynicism on the part of the faculty increased.

The faculty survey indicated that teachers were frustrated with the direction of this school year. "Change involves priority, elbow grabbing, broad involvement, a loose schedule, consensus." No cohesive efforts were being made in those directions.

Teacher participation had been diminished since the previous school year. "I'm concerned that too few teachers are involved," acknowledged one teacher. "...we need more general participation," commented another.

Whatever lingering momentum towards change that survived in the fall of '92 found expression in the new principal's formation of a "Futures Committee." He felt that in 1991-92, "What happened was an administrator took teachers who could go anywhere 'cause they're red hots, and that's good, and she created a critical mass with them and went very, very far, but the inclusion process, in terms of not just the total staff, but students and parents, community and district, was kind of exclusive." (Interview Dec. 2, 1992)

He was looking for a process for change that would involve shared decision making for all the stakeholders. In his vision, the Futures Committee would include anyone from the community who volunteered to serve in this group.

Involvement of parents, students and teachers in this group was relatively limited, however. This was due to the fact that neither faculty, nor parents, nor students had a tradition of this sort of empowerment, or the training to understand this new management model. "I didn't even know there was a Futures Committee. What is it

supposed to do?" was a remark made in March after seven months of meetings.

Despite limited teacher involvement (the most teachers in attendance at any one meeting was eleven) the one enduring contribution of the Futures Committee in 1992-93 to the change process was keeping the notion of "restructuring towards a user friendly schedule" alive. This was a much more involved project than the other two identified goals (beautifying and cleaning the campus and teaching the students to be responsible for their own garbage!) In effect, this substantial issue managed to keep restructuring alive "though badly in need of resuscitation," as one teacher so eloquently expressed.

This contribution supports the conclusion that teacher-leaders are a key to active change. Even though the number of teachers who attended these meetings was limited, they consciously kept the issue of a restructured schedule alive, accurately assessing that the Futures Committee was the decision making body for 1992-93.

True to his perception of his role as "facilitator of the process," the principal changed his goals at the direction of the Futures Committee, and reformatted faculty meetings to include discussion of restructuring. He also had district personnel present a workshop on restructuring to the Site Council of parents, students and teachers.

Recognizing that money would be crucial in supplying time to research and plan, the principal promoted a fund raiser called "The Pasta Extravaganza," produced in conjunction with the PTSA (Parent Student Teacher Association) with the express purpose of generating a Principal's Fund to be used to finance restructuring workshops and visitations at restructured schools. This investment of creativity, money and time spoke to the faculty's sense of the growing seriousness of the principal's commitment to change and his attempts at "facilitation".

The model of administration inspired, faculty led change process was epitomized in an in-service on "Second to None," the California state framework for restructured secondary schools. Under the guidance of a vice principal, individual faculty members, and one parent volunteer assumed the responsibility educate the rest of the faculty on the main themes of this state document. Following this in-service, X- High was on the verge of examining restructured schedules in place at other schools. The goal of this examination was to stimulate ideas by our own faculty for an effective schedule change that is curriculum driven at our own site.

Still, it is apparent in contrasting 1991-1992's agenda with the developments of 1992-93, that much momentum and direction had been lost.

What we still needed to do was refine a site based decision making process which involved broader elements of the community, including all stakeholders. Faculty meetings needed to be made more efficient, and a system of consensus building had to be created. Fortunately, a district wide system of securing waivers necessary to satisfy state and district requirements regarding curriculum, time management, etc. was already in place. RAC (Restructuring Advisory Council) was created in 1992 through the combined efforts of SRVEA, district personnel, and parents. It is strictly an advisory council for the process of gaining waivers and has no power to alter or impede any plan presented to it.

It looked like the agenda for 1993-94 was on track. "People feel positive about the young, committed, enthusiastic administration," beamed one admiring teacher in March, 1993.

Then, in early June of l993, news of this principal's resignation to serve as principal in a neighboring school district became public.

"Are you trying to tell me that this year was all B.S. again?" asked one exasperated teacher. "I'm tired of being the administration boneyard," said another.

TIME

"What I would see as a good administrator is you open the doors and you unlock the...you try and get people over the hurdles and you give them time." (Teacher interview, Nov. 1992)

Leadership alone is not the key factor in restructuring at our school. Leadership must provide an environment that will promote the change process. For example, the manipulation of a school day schedule to provide quality meeting time is the direct responsibility of leadership. This need for "time" was strongly indicated in the study of our data.

The problem of time at X High has been expressed under two guises: the time needed for effective planning, and the best use of time for instruction.

Time needed for effective planning is critical to consensus building. If only voluntary time is used then no real consensus can be achieved because volunteers are scarce. They are also almost a separate culture in that their time commitment indicates a degree of interest that may not be reflected by the faculty at large. "There are just certain groups of teachers that are really open and exchanging ideas and

doing things that are different." (Teacher interview, Nov. 1992)

The real gift of enough time for meetings is the inclusion of more faculty members. The problem lies with broadening faculty involvement "because better decisions are made when you involve people and when you exclude people from the process, you anger and alienate them and it doesn't go your way and those who are feared are hated." (Principal interview, Nov. 1992)

Involving all of the faculty means that there has to be a redefinition of the existing school day to create contractual time for discussion and exploration. Hearkening back to the first theme, this requires administrative leadership. Someone has to devise a way for faculty to meet regularly while still maintaining the education process on campus. Most teachers surveyed (78%) indicated a desire for "more staff development and for time for teachers to meet regularly." (Faculty Survey March 1992)

Time is important not only for teachers to meet together, but for students to engage with teachers as well. If the goal of restructuring is a more effective education for the student population, then the most effective use of students' time in school must be examined. This leads us to a consideration of our on-going discussion of school schedules.

In an era of "reduced resources" (money) schools are discovering the virtues in radically altered daily schedules. This creative reallocation of time can result in fewer student contacts for teachers and more in depth, effective instruction, utilizing available resources more efficiently. One example of a school schedule evaluated extensively by our faculty is that of Granada High School. There, ninety minute blocks meeting five days a week, in three blocks per day, allow students to complete a year long course in one semester. Therefore, a teacher whose normal student contact is 160 students per semester for one year, will now have personal contact with 80 students per semester, instead.

In 1991-92, restructuring was clearly a priority because release time was funded for teachers who chose to explore the concept. (See summary of meetings) At the beginning of 1992-93, faculty perception was that restructuring was clearly not a priority. The first indication was when the principal announced a "vacation from restructuring so we could get to know each other's names." The next indication was that any meetings regarding change were after school and on a voluntary basis. The faculty was unaware that funding was nonexistent. Administration did not share

financial information that would have considerably increased an understanding of shifting goals.

Despite these problems, the vacation appeared to be over when the focus on a "user friendly schedule" was delivered by the Futures Committee. Our principal bought into the concept, and began allocating portions of faculty in service days to restructuring.

However, the dynamics of these meetings made it apparent that infrequent full days were inferior to more frequent 2 hour meetings. For reasons discussed briefly below, there was a built in resentment by the faculty of full day meetings, and a sense that nothing was going to come of them. In our district, there are two discretionary days of leave allowed. No reason for absence needs to be given. The increase in discretionary day absence for these full day meetings was dramatic. Teachers felt that full days away from students caused a severe disruption in their education. The energy level at the end of full day meetings left a lot to be desired, too.

The administrative staff of 1992-93 directed by a committee of teacher volunteers, proposed a plan of bimonthly morning meetings for two hours each, followed by a condensed schedule of regular periods of class. This was presented to the faculty at large. After a lengthy meeting, the only consensus agreed to was for a minimum day meeting schedule. Whether to meet in the morning or afternoon was not resolved. The faculty voted was: Morning meetings - 17; Afternoon meetings - 16; Full day meetings - 14. It was hoped that a minimum day would provide an effective time frame for restructuring, with a higher sense of priority given the change process. The direction of these meetings would be at faculty discretion, combined with the constant focus provided by administrative leadership.

It was agreed that the initial focus of these meetings would be an examination of the best use of student/teacher time. A survey of faculty showed an acute awareness of decreasing state funds, the inefficiency of the present schedule, growing class sizes, and of the need to address these problems. (Faculty Survey March, 1992)

Nineteen of thirty-five teachers indicated that they were not happy with the present schedule. Twenty eight said they would be willing to teach longer classes with less frequent meeting times. One teacher found attractive "a schedule of four classes of ninety minutes per semester." Another sought "a more flexible schedule to help with student-teacher relationships." Lab teachers in particular sought "two hour blocks of time, twice a week."

"We must abolish our factory model schedule; we no longer train factory workers," said one teacher. Other teachers saw the opportunity for more team teaching and cross disciplinary instruction.

Interestingly enough, it seems that our faculty was excited by the possibility of change, especially in their own classroom, but not by the process of changing. Providing time for them to reach consensus may be the way to bridge this gap.

Over the summer all of this consensus decision making on the part of the faculty was thrown out. The site-council, made up of faculty and parents, was given our faculty proposal, and, despite a strong case advocated by a faculty member and an assistant Vice Principal, this council decided against the proposal because it would be too disruptive to the children's schedule. One parent deferred to the faculty decision, saying "teachers know best what their needs are" but a majority chose full day meetings. Students also overwhelmingly chose full days over partial release days.

This was truly consensus decision making on the part of the entire school community, but the problem was that the process was not clear to the entire faculty. The majority of faculty members felt that their decision was simply ignored and all the meeting time to arrive at faculty consensus was a waste. Leadership needed to explain the decision process in the interest of teacher morale. Teacher perception was that all the consensus decision making was thrown out over the summer due to lack of leadership.

Our faculty agrees that the need for time to rethink our educational process is crucial. Until other stakeholders also understand this need, there will be conflict, and progress towards change will be halted. This "stop and go" journey of school change at X High raises the third theme that emerged from our analysis.

MOMENTUM

X High is in a unique situation. We have experienced a sudden, dramatic commitment to restructuring, followed by its announced abandonment, concluded by its resurrection, followed by another abandonment. The question seems to be, "Can lost momentum be regained?" Our faculty must trust that change can happen before

they commit any more time to this process. In view of all of the administrative changes, this trust will never be built unless the faculty itself feels empowered to make decisions, and there is a structure in place for doing so.

The spotty attendance at "Futures Committee" meetings, the lack of enthusiasm at faculty meetings, the cynicism apparent in daily conversations all spoke to this lack of trust. "Without ____ (the key assistant principal of 1991-92) I don't where our administration stands," said one teacher. That sentiment was echoed " _____(the key assistant principal's) energy and enthusiasm are gone." Another addressed the issue of commitment. "No progress, why make the effort? I'm more choosy about what to spend my time on." (Faculty Survey March 1993)

Our faculty became more aware of the overwhelming scope of restructuring. This awareness, coupled with our perception that all our previous work had been sabotaged by administrative abandonment, caused a type of paralysis to set in. "I feel the changes we need to make are so massive that it has become frustrating for me to be involved. I don't see how we can possibly make these changes with the resources we have." (Faculty Survey March 1993)

In X High's particular circumstances, the issue of momentum may well be the key in the 1993-94 school year. Administrative and faculty leaders of the restructuring process must address the doubts, and reaffirm the possibility for change in a concrete way.

There was a temptation for some "quick fix" adjustments in the 1993-94 school year's schedule, primarily to rekindle hope that change was possible. Extended lunch periods, and extended homerooms were wisely rejected by the faculty as band aid fixes that were more cosmetic than curriculum motivated. If the faculty's energy and commitment are to be regained, change has to be real and sweeping, not superficial. Our faculty is suspicious of shallow fads. We are an experienced faculty who has "seen it all come and go." We can spot the difference between real educational improvements and "bread and circuses."

IMPLICATIONS

Because X High has been constantly changing administrators, there has been a minimal sense of continuity of leadership or goals to date. Instead of seeing this as an

opportunity for teacher-leaders to step into the vacuum of leadership that existed, the faculty resorted to a culture of complaint about lack of leadership. Faculty leadership has been discouraged with the abandonment of department chairpersons and the curriculum council formed by them. Class sizes have grown and the faculty shows the stress of continually changing leadership and larger work loads. There is no structure created to facilitate faculty leadership. What is needed is an emphasis on, and a mechanism for, stronger site-based leadership decision making.

Our experiences at X High suggest that leadership must be ***facilitated*** by site administration, and it is the responsibility of this group to maintain a delicate, continually redefined balance between all of the stakeholders. If an administrator values restructuring, he will deliver that message clearly to his faculty by making change a priority. Site administrators need to find ways to create the time necessary for faculty exploration of issues and consensus building crucial to the restructuring process. The only way momentum can gather for restructuring is through consistent, focused efforts, with agenda defined by ***faculty*** restructuring leaders as they become more educated to the issues.

Effective and sensitive administrators can "strategically manipulate" their teachers, identifying resistors, visionaries, pluggers, etc. A goal, then, should be to make negative teachers at least neutral; neutral teachers, positive; and positive teachers, zealots, with regard to creating real change. A way to achieve this is through broadening the involvement of all teachers through personal contact and invitation to become part of the process through specific kinds of participation (i.e. conferences, presentations, workshops and research). This can create such a high level of energy that even the most resistant teacher perceives the inevitability and advisability of change.

It is hard not to be cynical given the leadership changes that have rocked our school, destroying momentum, but we believe that certain elements of our lurching journey toward restructuring are common to all schools. The job cannot be done utilizing only volunteers. Site administration, supported by a district policy of aggressive fund raising, must legitimize the process by providing time and money to create the momentum necessary to achieve consensus by all stakeholders. Change must be an administrative priority, but more importantly, teachers must perceive themselves as leaders of the process. Teachers must create a site based decision making process that has real power and is immune to administrative changes.

Appendix A

Copy of Survey administered to staff in Nov. 1991:

To: Faculty and Staff at X High

From: Randy Kinavey and Lydia Schneider
Researchers for Bay Region IV Professional Development Consortium

Re: Restructuring

We are gathering data on faculty/staff attitudes toward school change. Please take a few moments to help us by filling out this questionnaire. All responses are confidential.

1. Do you think X High needs to make changes?

_____Yes _____No

If you answered "no," why not?

If you answered "yes," what changes do you see as necessary?
_____curriculum
_____schedule
_____teacher/student relationships
_____decision making
_____other

Please explain your answers.

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, how involved are you in the restructuring process at Cal High this year? Please circle your answer.

Not involved at all Extremely involved

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Last year?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

If there has been a change in your level of involvement, could you explain why:

3. Did you attend restructuring meetings other than required faculty meetings last year?

_____Yes _____No

4. Where you a member of the Restructuring Committee last year?

_____Yes _____No

5. Have you attended any futures Committee meetings this year?

_____Yes _____No

6. What do you see happening in the change process this year as opposed to last year?

How do you feel about these observations?

7. Who should lead the change process at X High?

_____district administration
_____site administration
_____teachers
_____staff
_____students
_____parents
_____other (identify)

Additional Comments?

Appendix B:

Copy of Survey administered to the faculty in March of 1993:

RESTRUCTURING TOWARDS A USER FRIENDLY SCHEDULE

Please take a moment to answer the following questions:

1. Are you satisfied with the present time schedule at our school?

   YES NO

2. Would you be willing to teach longer classes that did not meet as frequently?

   YES NO

3. Are you satisfied with the present lunch schedule?

   YES NO

4. What is your vision of the ideal school schedule?